

**REMARKS**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-4, 10-12, and 18-20 are amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner is advised that an Information Disclosure Statement was being filed on June 8, 2005. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge this IDS in the next official communication.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Further, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that claim 3 still lacks antecedent basis ...”. The Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to refer to claim 2.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended each of claims 2 and 3 to address the issues pointed out by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner will note that Claim 2, line 3 is amended herein to recite the battery. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (WO 03/091074); and

claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. (U.S. 4,158,346).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 10**

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, each of independent claims 1 and 10 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a ground structure for a vehicle, including *inter alia*

a negative terminal of the battery being grounded by being only connected the engine, the engine being grounded to the body frame by the first cable.

The novel features set forth in claims 1 and 10 can be seen in FIG. 3. As set forth in paragraph [00010] of the specification, "...the number ...of cables to be used in the vehicle need not be increased. Accordingly, the cost decrease and the convenience in management increased". Paragraphs [0003] and [0004] of the specification describe examples of the conventional art, in which multiple cables are used to ground the battery. The present

inventors conceived and reduced to practice the present invention to address the problem in the conventional art of having multiple grounding cables.

In contrast to the present invention, Suzuki et al. merely disclose a grounding structure in which the battery is grounded by two cables, one cable connected directly to the body location 8, and a second cable 1 connected through the engine to body location 3.

Similarly, as can be seen in Roberts '346 FIGS. 4 and 8, this document merely discloses two wires 46 and 54 connecting the battery to the engine.

Further, there is no motivation suggested in these references or the conventional art to reduce the number of cables used to ground the battery to one cable,

As such, no combination of Suzuki et al. and Roberts '346 can teach or suggest the invention as set forth in claims 1 and 10.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 10 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Suzuki et al. and Roberts '346.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 2-4, 11, and 18-20 are amended to place them in better form and to set forth additional novel features of the invention.

Support for the features included in claims 18 and 20 can be found for example, in paragraph [00020], which recites "ground cables for all electric parts (including sensors and switches) are integrated in the feedback ground cable C4".

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

*Application No. 10/617,049  
Amendment dated October 12, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 20, 2005*


*Docket No. 0505-1211P  
Art Unit: 3747  
Page 12 of 12*

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Date: October 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
James M. Slattery, #28,380  
P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/cm  
